

Specifically, the reference to Takeyama is directed to an apparatus for inspecting the pattern image of a reticle (col. 1, lines 6-8; col. 2, line 2 – 5; and claims). There is no disclosure in Takeyama of the method used to manufacture the reticle (shown in FIG. 1) in the first place.

The reference to Yui et al. is entirely directed to methods of aligning a reticle 3 (transfer mask) with a wafer to transfer several marks (3a-3y, for example), which make up the image pattern of the reticle 3, onto the wafer as a cohesive pattern. As with the reference to Takeyama, there are no teachings in the reference to Yui et al. of any method used to manufacture the reticle 3 in the first place.

That is, **both of these references only disclose techniques** that are carried **after a reticle has been manufactured**. On the other hand, as mentioned above, all of the limitations set out in Applicant's claims pertain to steps in the manufacture of one or more reticles. In Applicant's invention of claim 1, these steps culminate with the "forming [of] a reticle by batch-processing" coordinates of a process mark In Applicant's invention of claim 6, these steps culminate with the "drawing [of ] process marks on... scribe lane regions of...reticles". The references to Takeyama and Yui et al. can not render Applicant's claims obvious under 35 USC 103, even when the references are viewed in combination, because neither of the references are concerned with the manufacture of a reticle and hence, the references fail to teach at least either of the above-noted forming or drawing steps of claims 1 and 6, respectively.

In even more detail, according to a most basic aspect of Applicant's claimed invention, a database is provided from which information for laying out the process marks and scribe lane boundaries of reticles can be extracted. In this respect, claim 1 calls for "**creating a second database of...process marks and boundaries of scribe lanes** of reticles", and "inputting [information] of image patterns to be transcribed...**to extract from the second database the process marks and scribe lane boundaries** of reticles to be used..." (emphasis supplied). Similarly, claim 6 calls for " **creating a database including...** scribe lane region data representing **the form of scribe lanes...and process marks**", and "**selecting process marks and the region of scribe lanes...from the database**" (again, emphasis supplied).


Takeyama shows a reticle in FIG. 1 having a pattern image, but no scribe lanes or process marks are even alluded to in the reference. Yui et al. teach a reticle having process marks, e.g., alignment marks 3a1, 3a2...3y6, but there are no teachings in the reference as to how these process marks were selected for production on the reticle 3, nor is there any mention of how the scribe lanes (in which any of these process marks are located) were dimensioned. Accordingly, there are no teachings in the references corresponding to any of the above-quoted limitations of Applicant's claims 1 and 6. Hence, the references can not render Applicant's claims obvious under 35 USC 103.

For these reasons, namely because of the differences between Applicant's invention, as is now claimed, and the references, including the lack of disclosure in the references of a method of manufacturing a reticle, it is seen that the references do

not render Applicant's claims obvious under 35 USC 103. Accordingly, early reconsideration and allowance of the claims are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

VOLENTINE FRANCO & WHITT, PLLC

By:  Reg No 33,289  
Michael Stone  
Reg. No. 32,442

One Freedom Square  
Suite 1260  
11951 Freedom Drive  
Reston, VA 20190  
Tel. (571) 283-0720

Date: September 27, 2005